

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 6-9 have been amended. Claims 2-5 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer for filing in a continuation application. Thus, claims 1 and 6-9 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed November 10, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,741,182 to Lipps et al. ("Lipps") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,929,543 to Ueshima et al. ("Ueshima"), U.S. Patent No. 5,269,519 to Malone, and U.S. Patent No. 6,394,897 to Togami. It is noted that claims 1 and 6-9 have been amended. To the extent the rejection remains applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejection, as follows.

The Applicants invention, as recited in claims 1 and 6, includes a judgment circuit for judging whether a current position of said player is in a ball strikable range by comparing said predicted return position and the current position of said player, and a ball striking position movement circuit for automatically moving a ball striking position of said player to be approximated to said predicted return position in response to a negative judgment by said judgment circuit.

The Applicants submit that none of the cited art of record, nor combination thereof, discloses or suggests at least the combination of a judgment circuit for judging whether a current position of said player is in a ball strikable range by comparing said

predicted return position and the current position of said player; a ball striking position movement circuit for automatically moving a ball striking position of said player to be approximated to said predicted return position in response to a negative judgment by said judgment circuit, as recited in claims 1 and 6, as amended.

For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 1 and 6, as amended, are allowable over the cited art of record. As claims 1 and 6 are allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 7-9, which depend from either of allowable claims 1 and 6, are likewise allowable over the cited art of record.


Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket no. 100341-00054.

Respectfully submitted,


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX PLLC

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Telephone No. (202) 857-6104

Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC